IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH,

AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

W.P. No. 22016 OF 2005

Date: 07.10.2005

BETWEEN:

Godi Vijayalakshmi

.... PETITIONER

And

The Special Grade Deputy Collector (L.A.)

Steel Plant, Visakhapatnam,

Visakhapatnam District.

.... RESPONDENT

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S. RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 22016 OF 2005

ORDER:

The petitioner is allegedly a displaced person in the land acquisition for Visakhapatnam Steel Plant. She was allegedly given Rehabilitation Card No.283 and by reason of same, the Steel Plant Authorities and the Government allotted 120 Sq. yards of site in Kanithi, Vadlapudi R.H. Colony, on 18.5.1990 for providing self-employment. She constructed a thatched house and the same was burnt in a fire accident on 1.6.1996. The petitioner thereafter reconstructed the thatched house. She alleges that on 30.11.2004, when the District Collector, Joint Collector and Mandal Revenue Officer, Gajuwaka attempted to demolish the thatched house, she filed W.P.No.22209 of 2004. It was reported to the Court that the assignment/allotment of house site was cancelled on 3.12.2004. She alleges that the said copy was not served on her in spite of repeated requests, and

therefore, she seeks a direction to the respondents to serve a copy of the cancellation orders.

The Special Grade Deputy Collector, the sole respondent herein filed a caveat petition. In the caveat petition it is stated that the petitioner's husband Godi Mahalakshmi obtained Rehabilation Card in the name of petitioner by deceiving the Government and using the site and thatched house, where a Fruit Storage Godown is constructed instead of running Anganwadi. Therefore, the same was verified and found to be correct. Whereupon the Special Grade Deputy Collector (LA) cancelled the allotment vide Rc.No.1064/87 RI dated 3.12.2004, and a copy thereof was already sent to the petitioner through post.

The learned counsel for the petitioner however, vehemently denies that the respondent has sent the copy of the proceedings cancelling the allotment by post. Be that as it is, the only grievance of the petitioner is to get a copy of cancellation proceedings and therefore, she is given liberty to approach the respondent with a copy of this order. The respondent may consider her request by giving a copy of the cancellation proceedings immediately. This is however, does not preclude the respondent to take appropriate action against the petitioner, who allegedly obtained allotment of house site by playing fraud.

The Writ Petition, with the above observations, is accordingly disposed of at the admission stage.

_____

(**V.V.S. RAO, J.)**

7th October, 2005

Js